

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 12-28 are pending in the application. All pending claims stand rejected.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 15-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Coad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,851,107) in view of Weinberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,572) in view of Washburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,157,779) in view of Banning et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,567) in view of Rivlin (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,159).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites a computerized system for software development comprising:

- a source code editor operable to edit a source code module;

- a graphical design surface operable to display a graphical object representing actual code of the source code module and provide integrated testing of the source code module, wherein the integrated testing includes load testing;

- a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module;**

- an application datastore operative to store a previous version of the source code module,**

- wherein upon a change in the source code module, the change in the source code is immediately communicated to the graphical design surface and the graphical design surface is updated to reflect the change in the source code module,

- wherein the design surface displays the graphical object, the graphical object represents a database object, the design surface is operative to bind a particular database system to the database object, the database object further includes a database column, the source code module includes a variable, and the design surface is operative to bind the database column to the variable.

In order for a reference to anticipate this claim, or render it obvious, the recited language and its combination in the recited arrangement must be taught by the prior art. The undersigned respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the recited language, including that emphasized, and cannot possibly teach or even suggest the recited combination.

The Office acknowledges that neither Coad nor Weinberg teach a change manager operative to manage versioning of the source code module and an application datastore operative to store a previous version of the source code module. But the Office alleges that Washburn discloses these features and also suggests combining the features with Coad and Weinberg to create the recited system. The undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration.

Washburn discloses a testing system with the object of testing a wide variety of software programs across different types of hardware architectures (Col. 1, ll. 50-54). In the system disclosed by Washburn, a journal module provides the ability to *record events representative of user actions* taken to execute certain tasks which form the test (Col. 1, ll. 66-68). A save data module provides the capability in the testing system to *save data during execution of the test, the data being determinative of the pass/fail status of the test*. (Col. 8, ll. 33-37). The *data saved* is subsequently compared to *expected data, referred to as the master data* (Col. 8, ll. 38-39). If the data saved is not the same as the master data, the companion fails resulting in a test failure status (Col. 8, ll. 39-41).

Thus, Washburn discloses *comparing* a first file representative of *actual* responses of a software application with a second master file that contains *expected* responses of the software. In contrast, claim 1 recites a change manager operative to *manage versioning of the source code module*. An application such as that disclosed by Washburn that merely has *stored* therein two files containing *test responses* is not the same or even similar to a system such as recited in claim 1 that recites a manager operative to *manage versioning* of the *source code module*.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites an application datastore operative to store a *previous version of the source code module*. Storing two *test results files* as taught by Washburn is not the same as storing a *previous version of a source code module*. It is respectfully submitted that the two are not the same, nor are they even similar.

The Office Action alleges that Washburn discloses “updating the master data with the actual data” (Office Action, p.10). Even if this were true, the data discussed in Washburn is *test data*, not *source code* as recited in the claim. Further, *comparing two files* is not the same or equivalent to *managing versioning of source code*. The Office Action also alleges that “when the updating option is selected, the version of the previous master data stored in the

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0556/140707.1
Application No.: 09/717,680
Office Action Dated: May 14, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

master data file is update with the actual data” (Office Action, p. 10). Actually, Washburn discusses a testing scenario wherein when an “updating” feature is selected by the user, test data that has been identified to be masked is replaced with corresponding master data. This allows the tester to remove certain “masked” data from the analysis of the actual data.

However, Washburn does *not* discuss updating master data with actual data. Further, even if Washburn did operate as suggested, which it does not, *comparing two test datafiles, even if it involves replacing portions thereof*, is not the same or equivalent to *managing versioning of source code*.

Therefore, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the recited language, claim 1 and its dependent claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. For similar reasons, independent claims 15 and 22, and all claims depending therefrom, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable and the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in the event a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Date: August 30, 2007

/John E. McGlynn/
John E. McGlynn
Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439